

REMARKS

Claims 2-18 and 20-42 were pending and stand rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address her comments below.

Applicants are amending claims 2, 18, and 20 and adding claim 43 in this Amendment and Response. These changes are believed not to introduce new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested. In making these amendments, Applicants do not concede that the subject matter of the unamended claims was in fact disclosed or taught by the cited prior art. Rather, Applicants reserve the right to pursue such protection at a later point in time and merely seek to pursue protection for the subject matter presented in this submission.

In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 12-15, 17, 18, 20, 30-33, 35, 36, and 38-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Belfiore, U.S. Patent No. 6,009,459, in view of Mikheev, U.S. Patent App. Pub. 2002/0055919. Claims 3-8 and 21-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Belfiore in view of Mikheev and Konig, U.S. Patent No. 6,981,040. Claims 9-11 and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Belfiore in view of Mikheev and Sommerer, U.S. Patent App. Pub. 2004/0003351. Claims 16, 34 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

over Belfiore in view of Mikheev and Dumais, U.S Patent App. Pub. 2004/0267730. These rejections are traversed.

Independent claim 2, as amended, recites a method comprising:

receiving a term in an input field;
generating a user context-dependent search query based at least in part on a user context and the term, the search query for searching an article index for a first article identifier identifying a first article associated with the term;
receiving the first article identifier;
displaying in a transient menu associated with the input field the first article identifier and at least one hyperlinked menu item included within the first article, wherein the transient menu appears responsive to the received term being of a first type and disappears responsive to the received term being of a second type, the appearing and the disappearing occurring in response to the term being received.

The claimed invention thus describes a method for receiving a term in an input field, searching an article index for a first article identifier identifying a first article associated with the term, and displaying the received first article identifier and at least one hyperlinked menu item from the first article in a transient menu. The claimed invention specifically recites that the transient menu appears responsive to the received term being of a first type and disappears responsive to the received term being of a second type, the appearing and the disappearing occurring in response to the term being received. As one example, Figure 6 depicts a transient drop-down menu with two article identifiers appearing in response to receiving the terms “bobby flay” in the browser address bar. Further, paragraph 0086 of the specification discloses that in various embodiments the transient menu disappears when the user types a URL or other web address in the address bar, or disappears in response to the receipt of a predetermined term, substring, or characters, such as “http,” or “://” in a term receptacle.

In contrast, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest at least the operation of the claimed transient menu. Belfiore discloses automatically initiating a search for a resource such as a web site when a user has specified a URL or other text that is not a valid identifier for the resource. (Belfiore col. 2, lines 12-16). Specifically, the examiner cites Belfiore Figure 13B, which discloses a menu for displaying search results that is an alternative to displaying search results in a client area. However, this menu is not a “transient” menu that “appears responsive to the received term being of a first type and disappears responsive to the received term being of a second type, the appearing and the disappearing occurring in response to the term being received,” as claimed. Rather, it is an explicit user-requested search—the activation of a search button, e.g. by user mouse click—that causes the menu to be displayed. (Belfiore 8:15-16). Further, since the menu displays the results of an explicit search, it naturally remains visible until one of the search results is selected for viewing by a user, rather than disappearing responsive to receipt of a term.

Nor does Mikheev remedy the deficiencies of Belfiore. Mikheev generally discusses a way to cluster search results based on a logical relationship in order to permit a user to quickly identify documents of interest. (Mikheev, Abstract, Background). Mikheev does not disclose any user interface elements at all beyond the conventional search results interface of cited Figure 4, much less the claimed transient menu, nor does the Examiner allege that it does so.

The references cited with respect to the dependent claims—i.e. Konig, Sommerer, and Dumais—likewise fail to disclose or suggest the claimed transient menu that “appears responsive to the received term being of a first type and disappears responsive to the received term being of a second type, the appearing and the disappearing occurring in response to the

term being received.” Konig generally discusses “providing automatic, personalized information services.” (Konig, Abstract). Sommerer mentions a “browser navigation tool [that] allows a user to browse previously viewed resource pages during a browser session.” (Sommerer, Abstract). Dumais discusses performing “implicit or background queries to one or more information sources based on the ongoing activities of users.” (Dumais, Abstract). None of these references discloses the limitations missing from Belfiore and Mikheev, nor does the examiner allege that they do so.

Independent claim 18 recites “displaying in a transient menu near the network browser address bar the first URL and at least one hyperlinked menu item included within the first web page, wherein the transient menu appears responsive to the received term being of a first type and disappears responsive to the received term being of a second type, the appearing and the disappearing occurring in response to the term being received.” Independent claim 20 recites “displaying in a transient menu associated with the input field the first article identifier and at least one hyperlinked menu item included within the first article, wherein the transient menu appears responsive to the received term being of a first type and disappears responsive to the received term being of a second type, the appearing and the disappearing occurring in response to the term being received.” Thus, claims 18 and 20 are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 2.

The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 2, 18, or 20, and recite additional patentably distinct features and limitations, and are thus distinguishable from the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 2, 18, and 20.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-18 and 20-43 as presented herein are not rendered unpatentable by the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if she believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
DAVID BENJAMIN AUERBACH, ET AL.

Date: August 13, 2008

By: /Christopher King/

Christopher P. King, Reg. No. 60,985
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7633
Fax: (650) 938-5200